

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 20, 2007. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 8 and 11 are pending. Claims 4-7, 9, 10, 12 and 13 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1-3, 8 and 11 have been amended. Support for the claim changes can be found in the original disclosure, and therefore no new matter has been added. Claims 1, 8 and 11 are in independent form.

The Examiner objected to the specification on formal grounds and required a more descriptive title. The specification and title have been amended accordingly. Withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This claim has been amended. All of the claims are submitted to comply with Section 112. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 8 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,555,343 (*Luther*).

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Luther* in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,190,480 (*Sturgeon et al.*).

Claims 4-7, 9, 10, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sturgeon et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,337,349 (*Furohashi et al.*).

Without conceding the propriety of the rejections over the prior art, Claims

4-7, 9, 10, 12 and 13 have been canceled, and Claims 1-3, 8 and 11 have been amended.

Since Claims 4-7, 9, 10, 12 and 13 have been canceled, the rejection of those claims is moot. Applicants submit that the amended independent claims are allowable over the cited art, for at least the reasons set forth below.

Independent Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an extractor, arranged to extract information, which includes first character strings indicating contents of respective pages of a document and second character strings indicating page numbers of respective pages of the document, from recognized character strings, and a synthesizer, arranged to synthesize and output speech to indicate a relation between the first and second character strings. Each of independent Claims 8 and 11 recites, *inter alia*, the same or similar subject matter.

According to Applicants' claimed invention, a user can understand the relation between the contents of each page and the page number of that page (i.e., can understand what the contents of a given numbered page are) by listening to the synthesized and outputted speech such as "the first page is ... Guide to XX," or "the second page is ... the Table of Contents" or the like, as shown in Fig. 4B (see the specification at, e.g., page 8, line 24 - page 10, line 13). In the non-limiting example illustrated in Figs. 4A, 4B, 5A and 5B, "Guide to XX" (Fig. 4A) would be an example of a first character string, and "1" (Fig. 5A) would be an example of a second character string. "First page is ... Guide to XX" (Fig. 4B) would be an example of the synthesized and output speech indicating a relation between the first and second character strings.

*Luther* relates to a text parser for use with a text-to-speech converter. The text parser detects non-spoken and spoken characters. The spoken characters are parsed to the text-to-speech converter unaltered, while a text generator generates pre-designated text

sequences in response to non-spoken characters. A speech command generator generates speech commands in response to the detection of non-spoken characters. The text-to-speech converter converts spoken text parsed by the parser and text generated by the text generator into speech.

According to *Luther*, a facsimile image may be converted into a bit map image and the bit map image may be subjected to optical character recognition. The text resulting from the OCR, or portions thereof, may be parsed by the text parser. See col. 4, lines 26ff. However, nothing in *Luther* is understood to teach or suggest an extractor, arranged to extract information, which includes first character strings indicating contents of respective pages of a document and second character strings indicating page numbers of respective pages of the document, from recognized character strings, and a synthesizer, arranged to synthesize and output speech to indicate a relation between the first and second character strings, as claimed in independent Claim 1.

*Sturgeon et al.* relates to a method and apparatus for organizing scanned images. Misfeeds through a scanning device are identified by comparison of an anticipated number of pages with an actual number of scanned pages.

According to *Sturgeon et al.* a scanning device may have character recognition capabilities enabling it to analyze at least one region of a document page for identification of page designations. However, nothing in *Sturgeon et al.* is understood to teach or suggest an extractor, arranged to extract information, which includes first character strings indicating contents of respective pages of a document and second character strings indicating page numbers of respective pages of the document, from recognized character strings, and a synthesizer, arranged to synthesize and output speech to

indicate a relation between the first and second character strings, as claimed in independent Claim 1.

Even if *Furohashi et al.* be deemed to teach what is alleged in the Office Action, that document is not understood to remedy the above-described deficiencies of *Luther and Sturgeon et al.* with respect to independent Claims 1, 8 and 11.

Since the documents cited in the Office Action, whether taken singly or in combination (even assuming, for the sake of argument, that such combination were permissible), do not teach or suggest all of the elements of any of Applicants' independent claims, those claims are believed allowable over those documents.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. These claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from independent Claim 1 and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103, favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas W. Pinsky/

---

Douglas W. Pinsky  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 46,994

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
DWP/klm

FCBS\_WS 1431500v1